UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/553,479 10/17/2005		Mi Yeon Kim	P2958US00	8900
	7590 07/27/201 ASSOCIATES , PLC		EXAMINER	
8500 LEESBUI			PORTER, WILLIAM ERNEST	
SUITE 7500 VIENNA, VA 22182			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3623	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/27/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATENT@PARK-LAW.COM

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/553,479	KIM, MI YEON	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	WILLIAM PORTER	3623	

		WIEED WIT STATER	0020	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
THE F	REPLY FILED <u>01 July 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidaveal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, which pla with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a F	aces the Request
a)	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.		
b)	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailir	g date of the final rejection.	
	MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(
have bunder set for may re	ions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date een filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sthin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later duce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) CE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropriate exterinally set in the final Office action	sion fee ; or (2) as
	The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the	date of
	filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w IDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appea	
3. 🛛	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will <u>not</u> be entered because	
	(a) $oxtimega$ They raise new issues that would require further col	nsideration and/or search (see NO	TE below);	
	(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	· ·		
	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying the issue	es for
	(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	ected claims.	
	NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1			
4. 🔲	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	,	ompliant Amendment (PTOL-3	24).
5. 🔲	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	:	•	
6. 🗌	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).	lowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendment cance	eling the
7. 🛚	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proven the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ll be entered and an explanati	on of
	Claim(s) objected to:			
	Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
	DAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. 🔲	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bubecause applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to cashowing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fails to pro ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	
	The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.	
	The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	at does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowance beca	ıuse:
	Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Ref	h V. Boswell/			
	ervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3623			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: An additional search to address the conjunctive 'and' in claim 1 will be required..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 1 July 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments on claim1 and claim 8 were earlier presented as part of Remarks dated 12/16/2009 and responded to by examiner in Office Action dated 4/1/2010. Hence, Examiner has no further response. Applicant's arguments filed 1 July 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that inherency is established with the extrinsic evidence, must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the reference. Examiner responds that is proper to take into account reasonable inferences from the reference art. "[I]n considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take into account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom." In re Preda, 401 F.2d 825, 826, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968). See also, MPEP 2144.01.